arXiv:1608.06401v1 [math.NT] 23 Aug 2016

Distinct distances on regular varieties over finite fields

Pham Van Thang Do Duy Hieu

Abstract

In this paper we study some generalized versions of a recent result due to Covert, Koh, and Pi (2015). More precisely, we prove that if a subset $\mathcal{E}$ in a *regular* variety satisfies $|\mathcal{E}| \gg q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}}$, then

$$\Delta_{k,F}(\mathcal{E}) := \left\{F(\mathbf{x}^1+\cdots+\mathbf{x}^k)\colon \mathbf{x}^i \in \mathcal{E}, 1 \le i \le k\right\} \supseteq \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\},$$

for some certain families of polynomials $F(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1,\dots,x_d]$.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field of order q, where q is a prime power. Let $D(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^2+\cdots+x_d^2$ be a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1,\dots,x_d]$. For $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$, we define the D-distance set of $\mathcal{E}$ to be

$$\Delta(\mathcal{E}) = \{D(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})\colon \mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

There are various papers studying the cardinality of $\Delta(\mathcal{E})$, see for example [3, 9, 5, 4, 10] and references therein. In this paper, we are interested in the case when $\mathcal{E}$ is a subset in a *regular* variety. Let us first start with a definition of regular varieties which is taken from [4]

Definition 1.1. *For $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^d$, let $\mathbf{1}_\mathcal{E}$ denote the characteristic function on $\mathcal{E}$. Let $F(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1,\dots,x_d]$ be a polynomial. The variety $\mathcal{V} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d\colon F(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ is called a regular variety if $|\mathcal{V}| \asymp q^{d-1}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{1}_\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{m})} \ll q^{-(d+1)/2}$ for all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \setminus \mathbf{0}$, where*

$$\widehat{\mathbf{1}_\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{m})} = \frac{1}{q^d}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{F}_q^d} \chi(-\mathbf{m}\cdot\mathbf{x})\mathbf{1}_\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Here and throughout, $X \asymp Y$ means that there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that $C_1Y < X < C_2Y$, $X \ll Y$ means that there exists $C > 0$ such that $X \le CY$, and $X = o(Y)$ means that $X/Y \to 0$ as $q \to \infty$, where X, Y are viewed as functions in q.

There are several examples of regular varieties as follows:

1. Spheres of nonzero radii:

$$S_j = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d\colon ||\mathbf{x}|| = j\right\},\ j \in \mathbb{F}_q^* := \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\} \quad [9]$$

2. A paraboloid:
$$P = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \colon x_1^2 + \cdots + x_{d-1}^2 = x_d\right\} \quad [6]$$

3. Spheres defined by "Minkowski distance" with nonzero radii:
$$M_j = \left\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \colon x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdots x_d = j\right\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{F}_q^* \quad [7].$$

In 2007, Iosevich and Rudnev [9], using Fourier analytic methods, made the first investigation on the distinct distance problem on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{F}_q^d$. More precisely, they proved the following.

Theorem 1.2 (Iosevich et al., [9]). *For $\mathcal{E} \subseteq S_1$ in $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ with $d \geq 3$.*

1. *If $|\mathcal{E}| \geq Cq^{\frac{d}{2}}$ with a sufficiently large constant C, then there exists $c > 0$ such that $|\Delta(\mathcal{E})| \geq cq$.*
2. *If d is even and $|\mathcal{E}| \geq Cq^{\frac{d}{2}}$ with a sufficiently large constant C, then $\Delta(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{F}_q$.*
3. *If d is even, there exist $c > 0$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset S_1$ such that $|\mathcal{E}| \geq cq^{\frac{d}{2}}$ and $\Delta(\mathcal{E}) \neq \mathbb{F}_q$.*
4. *If d is odd and $|\mathcal{E}| \geq Cq^{\frac{d+1}{2}}$ with a sufficiently large constant $C > 0$, then $\Delta(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{F}_q$.*
5. *If d is odd, there exist $c > 0$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset S_1$ such that $|\mathcal{E}| \geq cq^{\frac{d+1}{2}}$ and $\Delta(\mathcal{E}) \neq \mathbb{F}_q$.*

Recently, Covert, Koh, and Pi [4] studied a generalization of Theorem 1.2, namely they dealt with the following question: How large does a subset $\mathcal{E}$ in a regular variety $\mathcal{V}$ need to be to make sure that $\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{F}_q$ or $|\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E})| \gg q$, where
$$\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E}) := \left\{D(\mathbf{x}^1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}^k) \colon \mathbf{x}^i \in \mathcal{E}, 1 \leq i \leq k\right\}? \tag{1.1}$$

The main idea in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is to reduce the distance problem to the dot product problem since the distance between two points $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in S_1 is $2 - 2\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = x_1y_1 + \cdots + x_dy_d$. Therefore
$$|\Delta(\mathcal{E})| = |\Pi_2(\mathcal{E})| := \{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} \colon \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{E}\}. \tag{1.2}$$

For the case $k \geq 3$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset S_1$, one can check that
$$|\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E})| = |\Pi_k(\mathcal{E})| := \left|\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{k} a_{ij} \cdot b_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{x}^i \cdot \mathbf{x}^j \colon \mathbf{x}^l \in \mathcal{E}, 1 \leq l \leq k\right\}\right|,$$
where $a_{ij} = 1$ if $i < j$ and 0 otherwise, and $b_{ij} = 1$ for $i = 1$ and -1 otherwise.

However, it seems hard to get a good estimate on $|\Pi_k(\mathcal{E})|$ when $k \geq 3$, and if the unit sphere S_1 is replaced by a general regular variety $\mathcal{V}$, there is no guarantee that the equality (1.2) will satisfy. Thus, in general, we can not apply the approach of the proof of Theorem 1.2 to estimate the cardinality of $\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E})$.

Using a new approach with Fourier analytic techniques, Covert, Koh and Pi [4] established that the condition on the cardinality of $\mathcal{E}$ in Theorem 1.2 can be improved to get $\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{F}_q$ with $k \geq 3$. The precise statement of their result is as follows.

Theorem 1.3 (Covert et al., [4]). *Suppose that $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ is a regular variety, and assume that $k \geq 3$ is an integer and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. If $q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}} = o(|\mathcal{E}|)$, then we have*

$$\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E}) \supseteq \mathbb{F}_q^* \quad \text{for even } d \geq 2,$$

and

$$\Delta_{k,D}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{F}_q \quad \text{for odd } d \geq 3.$$

It follows from Theorem 1.2 that in order to get $\Delta_{2,D}(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{F}_q$, the sharp exponent of the sets $\mathcal{E}$ of S_1 must be $d/2$ for even $d \geq 4$, and $(d+1)/2$ for odd $d \geq 3$. Theorem 1.3 implies that the exponent $d/2$ can be decreased to $\frac{d-1}{2} + \frac{1}{k-1}$ for $k \geq 3$ and any regular variety $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^d$.

The main purpose of this note is to prove two generalizations of Theorem 1.3 by employing techniques from spectral graph theory. Our first result is the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Let Q be a non-degenerate quadratic form on $\mathbb{F}_q^d$. Suppose that $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ is a regular variety, and assume that $k \geq 3$ is an integer and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. If $q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}} = o(|\mathcal{E}|)$, then for any $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$ we have*

$$\left|\left\{(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in \mathcal{E}^k \colon Q(\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k) = t\right\}\right| = (1 - o(1))\frac{|\mathcal{E}|^k}{q}.$$

Corollary 1.5. *Let Q be a non-degenerate quadratic form on $\mathbb{F}_q^d$. Suppose that $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ is a regular variety, and assume that $k \geq 3$ is an integer and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. If $q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}} = o(|\mathcal{E}|)$, then we have*

$$\Delta_{k,Q}(\mathcal{E}) \supseteq \mathbb{F}_q^*.$$

Let $P(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j x_j^s$ with $s \geq 2, a_j \neq 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, d$ be a diagonal polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$. We obtain the following generalization of Theorem 1.3, which is inspired by the paper [13].

Theorem 1.6. *Suppose that $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ is a regular variety, and assume that $k \geq 3$ is an integer and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. For $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$, if $|X||\mathcal{E}|^{2k-2} \gg q^{(d-1)(k-1)+2}$, we have*

$$|X + \Delta_{k,P}(\mathcal{E})| \gg q.$$

Corollary 1.7. *Suppose that $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ is a regular variety, and assume that $k \geq 3$ is an integer and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq V$. If $|\mathcal{E}| \gg q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}}$, we have*

$$|\Delta_{k,P}(\mathcal{E})| \gg q.$$

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Sections 2 and 3, we construct some graphs which are main tools of our later proofs. The proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 are presented in Sections 4 and 5, respectively.

2 Pseudo-random graphs

For a graph G of order n, let $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix. The quantity $\lambda(G) = \max\{\lambda_2, -\lambda_n\}$ is called the second eigenvalue of G. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is called an (n, d, λ)-graph if it is d-regular, has n vertices, and the second eigenvalue of G is at most λ.

For two (not necessarily) disjoint subsets of vertices $U, W \subseteq V$, let $e(U, W)$ be the number of ordered pairs (u, w) such that $u \in U$, $w \in W$, and (u, w) is an edge of G. It is well known that if λ is much smaller than the degree d, then G has certain random-like properties. More precisely, we have the following result on the number of edges between subsets in an (n, d, λ)-graph.

Lemma 2.1 (Chapter 9, [1]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an (n, d, λ)-graph. For any two sets $B, C \subseteq V$, we have*

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{d|B||C|}{n} \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{|B||C|}.$$

In [8], Hanson et al. proved the following version of the expander mixing lemma on the number of edges between multi-sets of vertices in an (n, d, λ)-graph.

Lemma 2.2 ([8]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an (n, d, λ)-graph. The number of edges between two multi-sets of vertices B and C in G, which is denoted by $e(B, C)$, satisfies:*

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{d|B||C|}{n} \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{\sum_{b \in B} m_B(b)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{c \in C} m_C(c)^2},$$

where $m_X(x)$ is the multiplicity of x in X.

2.1 Finite Euclidean graphs

Let Q be a non-degenerate quadratic form on $\mathbb{F}_q^d$. For any $t \in \mathbb{F}_q$, the finite Euclidean graph $E_q(d, Q, t)$ is defined as the graph with vertex set $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ and the edge set

$$E = \{(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \times \mathbb{F}_q^d \,|\, \boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{y},\, Q(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}) = t\}. \tag{2.1}$$

The (n, d, λ) form of the graph $E_q(d, Q, t)$ is estimated in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3 (Bannai et al. [2], Kwok [11]). *Let Q be a non-degenerate quadratic form on $\mathbb{F}_q^d$. For any $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$, the graph $E_q(d, Q, t)$ is a $(q^d, (1 + o(1))q^{d-1}, 2q^{(d-1)/2})$-graph.*

3 Pseudo-random digraphs

Let G be a directed graph (digraph) on n vertices where the in-degree and out-degree of each vertex are both d.

We define the adjacency matrix of G, denoted by A_G, as follows: $a_{ij} = 1$ if there is a directed edge from i to j and zero otherwise. Let $\lambda_1 = d, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of A_G. These numbers are complex numbers, so we can not order them, but we have $|\lambda_i| \leq d$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We define $\lambda(G) := \max_{|\lambda_i| \neq d} |\lambda_i|$.

An $n \times n$ matrix A is normal if $A^t A = A A^t$, where A^t is the transpose of A. We say that a digraph is normal if its adjacency matrix is a normal matrix. There is a simple way to check whether a digraph is normal. In a digraph G, let $N^+(x, y)$ be the set of vertices z such that $\overrightarrow{xz}, \overrightarrow{yz}$ are edges, and $N^-(x, y)$ be the set of vertices z such that $\overrightarrow{zx}, \overrightarrow{zy}$ are edges. One can easily check that G is normal if and only if $|N^+(x, y)| = |N^-(x, y)|$ for any two vertices x and y.

We say that G is an (n, d, λ)-digraph if G is normal and $\lambda(G) \leq \lambda$. Let G be an (n, d, λ)-digraph. For two (not necessarily) disjoint subsets of vertices $U, W \subset V$, let $e(U, W)$ be the number of ordered pairs (u, w) such that $u \in U$, $w \in W$, and $\overrightarrow{uw} \in E(G)$ (where $E(G)$ is the edge set of G). Vu [14] developed a directed version of the Lemma 2.1 as follows.

Lemma 3.1 (Vu, [14]). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an (n, d, λ)-digraph. For any two sets $B, C \subset V$, we have*

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{d}{n}|B||C| \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{|B||C|}.$$

By using similar arguments as in the proofs of [8, Lemma 16] and [14, Lemma 3.1], we obtain the multiplicity version of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.2 (Multiplicity version). *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an (n, d, λ)-digraph. For any two multi-sets B and C of vertices , we have*

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{d}{n}|B||C| \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{\sum_{b \in B} m_B(b)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{c \in C} m_C(c)^2},$$

where $m_X(x)$ is the multiplicity of x in X.

We leave the proof of Lemma 3.2 to the interested reader.

4 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Let H be a finite (additive) abelian group and S be a subset of H. Define a directed Cayley graph C_S as follows. The vertex of C_S is H. There is a directed edge from x to y if and only if $y - x \in S$. It is clear that every vertex C_S has out-degree $|S|$. Let χ_α, $\alpha \in H$, be the additive charaters of H. It is well known that for any $\alpha \in H$, $\sum_{s \in S} \chi_\alpha(s)$ is an eigenvalue of C_S, with respect the eigenvector $(\chi_\alpha(x))_{x \in H}$.

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a regular variety defined by

$$\mathcal{V} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \colon F(\mathbf{x}) = 0\},$$

for some polynomial $F \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$.

The Cayley graph $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ is defined with $H = \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $S = \mathcal{V}$. In particular, the edge set of the Cayley graph $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ is defined by

$$E(C_{\mathcal{V}}) = \{\overrightarrow{(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})} \in H \times H \colon \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}\}.$$

For any two vertices $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ in H, we have

$$|N^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| = |N^-(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})| = |(\mathbf{x} + \mathcal{V}) \cap (\mathbf{y} + \mathcal{V})|,$$

which implies that $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ is normal. We now study the (n, d, λ) form of this digraph in the next theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *The Cayley graph $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a $(q^d, |\mathcal{V}|, cq^{(d-1)/2})$-digraph for some positive constant c.*

Proof. It is clear that $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ has q^d vertices and the in-degree and out-degree of each vertex are both $|\mathcal{V}|$. Next, we will estimate eigenvalues of $C_{\mathcal{V}}$. The exponentials (or characters of the additive group $\mathbb{F}_q^d$)

$$\chi_{\boldsymbol{m}}(\mathbf{x}) = \chi(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{m}), \tag{4.1}$$

for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$, are eigenfunctions of the adjacency operator for the graph $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\mathbf{m}} &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}} \chi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}} \chi(\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{m}) \\ &= q^d \widehat{\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}(-\mathbf{m})} \\ &\ll q^{(d-1)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

when $\mathbf{m} \neq \mathbf{0}$. If $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$, then $\lambda_{\mathbf{0}} = |\mathcal{V}|$, which is the largest eigenvalue of $C_{\mathcal{V}}$. In other words, $C_{\mathcal{V}}$ is a $(q^d, |\mathcal{V}|, cq^{(d-1)/2})$-digraph for some positive constant c. □

In order to prove Theorem 1.4, we need the following notations.

For an even integer $k = 2m \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$, the k-energy is defined by

$$\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) = \left|\left\{(\mathbf{x}^1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in \mathcal{E}^k \colon \mathbf{x}^1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}^m = \mathbf{x}^{m+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{x}^k\right\}\right|.$$

For $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^d$, we define

$$\nu_k(t) = \left|\left\{(\mathbf{x}^1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}^k) \in \mathcal{E}^k \colon Q(\mathbf{x}^1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}^k) = t\right\}\right|.$$

In our next lemmas, we give estimates on the magnitude of $\nu_k(t)$.

Lemma 4.2. *For $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $k \geq 2$ even, we have*

$$\left|\nu_k(t) - (1+o(1))\frac{|\mathcal{E}|^k}{q}\right| \leq q^{(d-1)/2}\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})$$

.

Proof. Suppose that $k = 2m$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be multi-sets of points in $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ defined as follows

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_m \colon \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{E}, 1 \leq i \leq m\}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \{-\mathbf{x}_{m+1} - \cdots - \mathbf{x}_k \colon \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{E}, m+1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{A}} m_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{a})^2 = \Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}), \quad \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{B}} m_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{b})^2 = \Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}),$$

and $\nu_k(t)$ is equal to the number of edges between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in the graph $E_q(d, Q, t)$. Thus the lemma follows immediately from Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.3. □

By using the same techniques, we get a similar result for the case k odd.

Lemma 4.3. *For $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $k \geq 3$ odd, we have*

$$\left|\nu_k(t) - (1+o(1))\frac{|\mathcal{E}|^k}{q}\right| \leq 2q^{(d-1)/2}\left(\Lambda_{k-1}(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1/2}\left(\Lambda_{k+1}(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1/2}.$$

Combining Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a set in $\mathbb{F}_q^d$. Then we have*

1. *If $q^{\frac{d+1}{2}}\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) = o(|\mathcal{E}|^k)$ and k is even, then*

$$\left|\left\{(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in \mathcal{E}^k \colon Q(\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k) = t\right\}\right| = (1+o(1))\frac{|\mathcal{E}|^k}{q}.$$

2. *If $q^{\frac{d+1}{2}}(\Lambda_{k-1}(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2}(\Lambda_{k+1}(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2} = o(|\mathcal{E}|^k)$ and k is odd, then*

$$\left|\left\{(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in \mathcal{E}^k \colon Q(\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k) = t\right\}\right| = (1+o(1))\frac{|\mathcal{E}|^k}{q}.$$

Theorem 4.4 implies that in order to prove Theorem 1.4, it is sufficient to bound $\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})$.

Lemma 4.5. *For a regular variety $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$. If $k \geq 4$ is even, and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V}$, we have*

$$\left|\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) - (1+o(1))\frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{k-1}}{q}\right| \ll q^{(d-1)/2}(\Lambda_{k-2}(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2}(\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is a subset in the variety $\mathcal{V}$, we have the following estimate

$$\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_{k-1}\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{x}_1+\cdots+\mathbf{x}_{k/2}-\mathbf{x}_{k/2+1}-\cdots-\mathbf{x}_{k-1}).$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be two multi-sets defined by

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\mathbf{x}_1+\cdots+\mathbf{x}_{k/2}\colon \mathbf{x}_i\in\mathcal{E}, 1\leq i\leq k/2\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B} := \{-\mathbf{x}_{k/2+1}-\cdots-\mathbf{x}_{k-1}\colon \mathbf{x}_i\in\mathcal{E}, k/2+1\leq i\leq k-1\}.$$

It is clear that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathcal{A}} m_{\mathcal{A}}(a)^2 = \Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}), \quad \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathcal{B}} m_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{b})^2 = \Lambda_{k-2}(\mathcal{E}).$$

On the other hand, $\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})$ is equal to the number of edges between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in the Cayley graph $C_{\mathcal{V}}$. Thus the lemma follows from Lemmas 3.2 and 4.1. □

For $\mathcal{E}\subseteq\mathcal{V}$ and $k\geq 4$ even, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that

$$\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) \ll \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{k-1}}{q} + q^{(d-1)/2}(\Lambda_{k-2}(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2}(\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2}.$$

Solving this inequality in terms of $\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})$ gives us

$$\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) \ll q^{d-1}\Lambda_{k-2}(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{k-1}}{q}.$$

Using inductive arguments, we obtain the following estimate for $\mathcal{E}\subseteq\mathcal{V}$ and $k\geq 4$ even

$$\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) \ll q^{\frac{(d-1)(k-2)}{2}}\Lambda_2(\mathcal{E}) + \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{k-1}}{q}\sum_{j=0}^{(k-4)/2}\left(\frac{q^{d-1}}{|\mathcal{E}|^2}\right)^j. \tag{4.2}$$

If we assume that $|\mathcal{E}| > q^{(d-1)/2}$, then the inequality (4.2) implies the following theorem.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a subset of a regular variety $\mathcal{V}$ in $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ with $|\mathcal{E}| > q^{(d-1)/2}$.*

1. *If $k\geq 2$ is even, then*

$$\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) \ll q^{\frac{(d-1)(k-2)}{2}}|\mathcal{E}| + \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{k-1}}{q}.$$

2. *If $k\geq 3$ is odd, then*

$$\Lambda_{k-1}(\mathcal{E})\Lambda_{k+1}(\mathcal{E}) \ll q^{(d-1)(k-2)}|\mathcal{E}|^2 + q^{\frac{(d-1)(k-3)-2}{2}}|\mathcal{E}|^{k+1} + \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{2k-2}}{q^2}.$$

Note that the first statement of Theorem 4.6 follows from (4.2) with the facts that $\Lambda_2(\mathcal{E}) = |\mathcal{E}|$ and $\frac{q^{d-1}}{|\mathcal{E}|^2} < 1$, and the second is a consequence of the first one.

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We now consider two following cases:

Case 1: If $k \geq 2$ is even and $q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}} = o(|\mathcal{E}|)$, then it follows from Theorem 4.6 that

$$q^{\frac{d+1}{2}}\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E}) = o(|\mathcal{E}|^k).$$

Case 2: If $k \geq 3$ is odd and $q^{\frac{d-1}{2}+\frac{1}{k-1}} = o(|\mathcal{E}|)$, then it follows from Theorem 4.6 that

$$q^{\frac{d+1}{2}}(\Lambda_{k-1}(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2}(\Lambda_{k+1}(\mathcal{E}))^{1/2} = o(|\mathcal{E}|^k).$$

In other words, Theorem 1.4 follows immediately from Theorem 4.4.

□

5 Proof of Theorem 1.6

To prove Theorem 1.6, we need to construct a new Cayley graph as follows.

Let $P(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j x_j^s \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$ with $s \geq 2, a_j \neq 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, d$, and

$$P'(x_1, \ldots, x_{2d}) = P(x_1, \ldots, x_d) - P(x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_{2d}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \ldots, x_{2d}].$$

We define the graph $C_{P'}(\mathbb{F}_q^{2d+1})$ to be the Cayley graph with $H = \mathbb{F}_q \times \mathbb{F}_q^{2d}$ and $S = \{(x_0, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{F}_q \times \mathbb{F}_q^{2d} \mid x_0 + P'(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$, i.e.

$$E(C_{P'}(\mathbb{F}_q^{2d+1})) = \left\{\overrightarrow{((x_0, \mathbf{x}), (y_0, \mathbf{y}))} \in H \times H \colon y_0 - x_0 + P'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) = 0\right\}.$$

The (n, d, λ) form of $C_{P'}(\mathbb{F}_q^{2d+1})$ was studied in [13].

Lemma 5.1 ([13])**.** *For any odd prime power q, $d \geq 1$, then $C_{P'}(\mathbb{F}_q^{2d+1})$ is a*

$$(q^{2d+1}, q^{2d}, q^d) - \textit{digraph.}$$

For $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$, define

$$\nu_{P,k}(t) = \left|\{(a, \mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in X \times \mathcal{E}^k \colon a + P(\mathbf{x}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k) = t\}\right|.$$

Our next lemmas are the main steps in the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Lemma 5.2. *For $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $k \geq 2$ even, we have the following estimate*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q} \nu_{P,k}(t)^2 \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{2k}|X|^2}{q} + q^d|X|\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})^2.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be multi-sets defined by:

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(a, -\mathbf{x}_1 - \cdots - \mathbf{x}_{k/2}, -\mathbf{y}_1 - \cdots - \mathbf{y}_{k/2}) \colon a \in X, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{E}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B} := \{(b, \mathbf{x}_{k/2+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{y}_{k/2+1} + \cdots + \mathbf{y}_{k/2+1}) \colon b \in X, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

One can check that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{A}} m_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x})^2 = |X|\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})^2, \ \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{B}} m_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathbf{x})^2 = |X|\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})^2, \ |\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{B}| = |X||\mathcal{E}|^k.$$

On the other hand, it is clear that $\sum_{t\in\mathbb{F}_q} \nu_{P,k}^2$ is equal to the number of edges from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ in the graph $C_{P'}(\mathbb{F}_q^{2d+1})$. Thus it follows from Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 5.1 that

$$\sum_{t\in\mathbb{F}_q} \nu_{P,k}(t)^2 \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{2k}|X|^2}{q} + q^d|X|\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})^2.$$

This ends the proof of the lemma. □

By employing the same techniques, we get a similar result for the case $k \geq 3$ odd.

Lemma 5.3. *For $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^d$ and $k \geq 3$ odd, we have the following estimate*

$$\sum_{t\in\mathbb{F}_q} \nu_{P,k}(t)^2 \leq \frac{|\mathcal{E}|^{2k}|X|^2}{q} + q^d|X|\Lambda_{k-1}(\mathcal{E})\Lambda_{k+1}(\mathcal{E}).$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. It follows from the proof of Theorem 2.6 in [13] that

$$|X + \Delta_{k,P}(\mathcal{E})| \gg \frac{|X|^2|\mathcal{E}|^{2k}}{\sum_{t\in\mathbb{F}_q} \nu_{P,k}(t)^2}.$$

Therefore from Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3, we get two following cases:

1. If $k \geq 2$ is even, we obtain

$$|X + \Delta_{k,P}(\mathcal{E})| \gg \min\left\{\frac{|X||\mathcal{E}|^{2k}}{q^d\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})^2}, q\right\}.$$

2. If $k \geq 3$ is odd, we obtain

$$|X + \Delta_{k,P}(\mathcal{E})| \gg \min\left\{\frac{|X||\mathcal{E}|^{2k}}{q^d\Lambda_k(\mathcal{E})\Lambda_{k-1}(\mathcal{E})}, q\right\}.$$

Thus Theorem 1.6 follows immediately from Theorem 4.6, which concludes the proof of the theorem. □

Acknowledgements.

The first author was partially supported by Swiss National Science Foundation grants 200020-162884 and 200020-144531.

References

[1] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, *The probabilistic method*, 2nd ed., Willey-Interscience, 2000.

[2] E. Bannai, O. Shimabukuro and H. Tanaka, *Finite analogues of non-Euclidean spaces and Ramanujan graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **25** (2004), 243–259.

[3] J. Bourgain, N. Katz, and T. Tao, *A sum product estimate in finite fields and Applications*, Geom. Funct. Analysis, **14** (2004), 27–57.

[4] D. Covert, D. Koh, Y. Pi, *The k-resultant modulus set problem on algebraic varieties over finite fields*, arXiv: 1508.02688 (2015).

[5] D. Covert, D. Koh, and Y. Pi, *On the sums of any k points in finite fields*, accepted in SIAM 2016.

[6] G. Mockenhaupt, T. Tao, *Restriction and Kakeya phenomena for finite fields*, Duke Math. J. **121** (2004), no. 1, 35–74.

[7] D. Hart, A. Iosevich, J. Solymosi, *Sum-product estimates in finite fields via Kloosterman sums*, Int. Math. Res. Not. no. 5, (2007) Art. ID rnm007.

[8] B. Hanson, B. Lund, and O. Roche-Newton, *On distinct perpendicular bisectors and pinned distances in finite fields*, Finite Fields and Their Applications, **37** (2016), 240-264.

[9] A. Iosevich and M. Rudnev, *Erdős distance problem in vector spaces over finite fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **359** (2007), 6127–6142.

[10] D. Koh and H. Sun, *Distance sets of two subsets of vector spaces over finite fields*, PAMS, to appear, arXiv:1212.5305.

[11] W.M. Kwok, *Character tables of association schemes of affine type*, European J. Combin. **13** (1992) 167–185.

[12] D. Koh and C-Y. Shen, *The generalized Erdős-Falconer distance problems in vector spaces over finite fields*, Journal of Number Theory, **132**(11) (2012): 2455–2473.

[13] L.A.Vinh, *On the generalized Erdős–Falconer distance problems over finite fields*, J. Number Theory, **133** (2013) 2939–2947.

[14] Vu Ha Van, *Sum-product estimates via directed expanders*, Mathematical research letters, **15**(2) (2008): 375–388.

Department of Mathematics,
EPF Lausanne
Switzerland
E-mail: thang.pham@epfl.ch

Institute of Mathematics,
Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology
E-mail: ddhieu@math.ac.vn